



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

as long as the grand jury itself is legally constituted and the proceedings are actually fair, and hold that the technical error of the outsider's presence is not ground for quashing the indictment. *Blevins v. State*, 68 Ala. 92; *Bennett v. State*, 62 Ark. 516. It is submitted that this error is more properly one of form only, and is therefore cured by the federal statute. See U. S. COMP. ST. (1901) 720, § 1025.

INFANTS — CONTRACTS AND CONVEYANCES — ABATEMENT IN PURCHASE PRICE AT EXPENSE OF INFANTS. — The plaintiff purchased a farm of the defendants. Both the contract of sale and the deed mentioned its contents as "245 acres, more or less." As some of the vendors were infants, the sale was ratified by the court. The plaintiff, later discovering that the farm contained only 235 acres, brought a bill in equity for an abatement of the purchase price. *Held*, that the abatement be allowed. *McComb v. Gilkeson*, 66 S. E. 77 (Va.). See NOTES, p. 473.

INJUNCTION — ACTS RESTRAINED — CRIMINAL PROCEEDINGS. — Three plaintiffs brought a bill to enjoin the sheriff and district attorney from prosecuting them under a state liquor law alleged to be invalid. *Held*, that equity will not grant the injunction. *J. W. Kelly & Co. v. Conner*, 123 S. W. 622 (Tenn.). See NOTES, p. 469.

INJUNCTION — ACTS RESTRAINED — PASSAGE OF MUNICIPAL ORDINANCES. — The plaintiff sought to restrain the members of the council of the defendant city from passing an ordinance compelling the plaintiff to build viaducts over certain crossings. *Held*, that the injunction should be refused. *Chicago, Rock Island, & Pacific Ry. Co. v. City of Lincoln*, 124 N. W. 142 (Neb.). See NOTES, p. 470.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE — CONTROL BY STATES — REGULATION OF RATES ON INTERSTATE FERRIES. — A New Jersey statute of 1799 empowers the boards of chosen freeholders to fix rates to be taken at ferry stations within their respective counties. The board of Hudson County fixed the rates to be taken by ferries plying between that county and New York City. *Held*, that the rates so fixed are valid. *New York Cent. & H. R. R. Co. v. Board of Chosen Freeholders*, 74 Atl. 954 (N. J., Ct. Err. & App.).

From a time antedating the Revolution, states have exercised the power of regulating ferries, and no exception has been made in the case of interstate ferries. When the power came to be contested under the federal Constitution, the states held that they had only potentially ceded their jurisdiction to Congress and could therefore continue to exercise it until Congress intervened. *The People v. Babcock*, 11 Wend. (N. Y.) 587; *Freeholders of Hudson Co. v. State*, 24 N. J. L. 718. The Supreme Court in several cases adopted the same view. *Fanning v. Gregoire*, 16 How. (U. S.) 524; *Wiggins Ferry Co. v. East St. Louis*, 107 U. S. 365. Later federal cases, however, have encroached upon this doctrine. A state cannot regulate tolls over an interstate bridge. *Covington & Cincinnati Bridge Co. v. Kentucky*, 154 U. S. 204. Nor can a state regulate an interstate ferry for railroad cars which is not a ferry in the technical historic sense. *St. Clair County v. Interstate Transfer Co.*, 192 U. S. 454. When called upon, the Supreme Court may regard their earlier cases as overruled, but in view of the historic usage, the principal case wisely determined to adhere to the established principle until the Supreme Court should pass upon it directly. The need of some regulation respecting carriers of such general utility and the difficulty of any uniform regulation by Congress argue potently in favor of the established rule.

JUDGMENTS — EQUITABLE RELIEF — DEFAULT DUE TO ILLNESS OF COUNSEL. — In a petition for an injunction to restrain the enforcement of a judgment, the petitioner alleged that he had a complete defense to the action at law, but that his attorney was incapacitated for professional work by sudden illness, that he